UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,350	06/13/2005	Donald Paul Gardner	A36426-PCT-USA (072819.01	3933

21003 7590 11/05/2008

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
44TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498

EXAMINER	
FONSECA, JESSIE T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3633	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/05/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DLNYDOCKET@BAKERBOTTS.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/517,350	GARDNER, DONALD PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JESSIE FONSECA	3633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-15 and 17-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-15 and 17-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08 December 2004* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the floor covering wound onto a core (claims 20-21) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 11-15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kotler (US 4,860,510).

With regards to claim 1: Kotler discloses a ventilating decorative floor covering (10) being a single sheet plastics floor covering (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 6; col. 5, lines 41-45) and having a decorative upper surface (col. 5, lines 16-19) and a lower surface on which are formed one or more studs (19) (figs. 1-2) (col. 5, lines 16-19).

The floor covering of Kotler is capable of loose laying on an upper surface of a floor so that, in use, an air gap is formed between the lower surface of the floor covering and the upper surface of the floor sufficient to ventilate the floor.

Note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

With regards to claim 11: Kotler further disclose the floor covering is a heterogeneous floor covering (fig. 1)

With regards to claim 12: The cushion plate of Kotler having a flat finish on the top surface which is adapted for foot traffic (col. 5, lines 16-19) is considered a wear layer.

With regards to claim 13: Kotler further disclose the upper surface includes a flat finish or can be textured (col. 5, lines 16-19).

With regards to claim 14: Kotler further discloses a support (support grid, 11).

With regards to claim 15: Kotler discloses a ventilating decorative floor covering (10) being a plastics floor covering (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 6; and col. 5, lines 41-45) and having a decorative upper surface and a lower surface on which are formed one or more studs (19) (figs. 1-2) (col. 5, lines 16-19) to provide an air gap between the lower surface of the floor covering and the upper surface of the floor sufficient to ventilate the floor (col. 1, lines 10-15)

With regards to claim 18: Kotler discloses a combination of a floor having an upper surface (col. 1, line 10-14) and a ventilating decorative floor covering (10) for loose laying on the upper surface of the floor wherein the floor covering is a single sheet plastics floor covering (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 6; and col. 5, lines 41-45) and has a decorative upper surface (col. 5, lines 16-19) and a lower surface on which are formed one or more studs (9) so that an air gap is formed between the lower surface of the floor covering and the upper surface of the floor sufficient to ventilate the floor (col. 1, lines 6-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-3 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotler (US 4,860,510) in view to Fanti (US 2001/0034983 A1).

With regards to claim 2-3: Kotler discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to discloses the being the lower surface being modified to ensure that there is adequate grip between the lower surface of the floor covering and the floor to which is applied.

However, Fanti discloses a flooring covering (par. 0001) having a roughened surface lower surface to enhance the securement of the flooring to the surface in which it is to be laid (par. 0015).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the floor covering of Kotler to include a roughened lower surface as taught by Fanti in order to provide a lower surface having a greater coefficient of friction with the surface in which it was laid for increased stability and securement.

With regards to claim 19: Kotler discloses a ventilating decorative floor covering (10) being a plastics floor covering (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 6; col. 5, lines 41-45) and having a decorative upper surface and a lower surface on which are formed one or more studs (19) (figs. 1-2) (col. 5, lines 16-19).

The floor covering of Kotler is capable of loose laying on an upper surface of a floor so that, in use, an air gap is formed between the lower surface of the floor covering and the upper surface of the floor sufficient to ventilate the floor. Note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Kotler, discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to disclose the lower surface being modified to ensure that there is adequate grip between the lower surface of the floor covering and the floor to which is applied

However, Fanti discloses a flooring covering (par. 0001) having a roughened surface lower surface to enhance the securement of the flooring to the surface in which it is to be laid (par. 0015).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the floor covering of Kotler to include a roughened lower surface as taught by Fanti in order to provide a lower surface having a greater coefficient of friction with the surface in which it was laid for increased stability and securement.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11-15, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shortland et al. (WO 00/42274) in view of Oakley (GB 690,863).

With regards to claim 1: Shortland et al. discloses a decorative single sheet plastics floor covering comprising a decorative upper surface (fig. 1; pg. 1, lines 1-5; pg. 6, lines 21-25).

Shortland et al. discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to disclose one or more studs formed on the lower surface of the floor covering.

However, Oakley discloses flooring tile having one or more studs formed on the lower surface so as to provide ventilation (col. 4, lines 71-78; figs. 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the floor covering of Shortland et al. to include one or more studs formed on the lower surface of the floor covering as taught by Oakley in order to provide means for ventilation (col. 4, lines 71-78)

The floor covering of Shortland et al., in view of Oakley, is capable of loose laying on an upper surface of a floor so that, in use, an air gap is formed between the lower surface of the floor covering and the upper surface of the floor sufficient to ventilate the floor. Note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

With regards to claims 2, 3, & 5: Shortland et al. further discloses the modification of the floor surface (1) in the form of a softening agent, such as a plasticizer (page 8, lines 5-10). As disclosed by the applicant on lines 24-26, page 3 of the disclosure, the lower surface can be softened using a plasticizer. It is noted that any amount of plasticizer other than the minimum amount used is considered additional plasticizer. Therefore, the floor covering of Shortland et al. including a plasticizer is considered equivalent to that of applicant's.

With regards to claim 6: Shortland et al. further discloses one or more particulate materials (6) in the upper surface of the floor covering (1) to provide slip resistance (fig. 1; abstract; page 3, lines 7-15 & lines 20-23).

With regards to claim 7: Shortland et al. further discloses the particulate material (6) is embedded in the decorative upper surface of the flooring covering (1) is at least partially protruding from the upper surface to achieve adequate slip resistance (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 7-15).

With regards to claim 9: Shortland et al. further discloses the plastics material is selected from a group consisting of PVC, plasticized acrylic, polyester, and a PVC plastisol material (fig. 1; pg. 3, lines 7-15).

With regards to claim 11: Shortland et al., further discloses the floor covering is heterogeneous flooring covering (fig. 1).

With regards to claim 12: Shortland et al. further discloses wear layer (3) (fig. 1).

With regards to claim 13: Shortland et al. further discloses a pigment (pg. 8, lines 6-8) and pigmented PVC chips (pg. 3, lines 20-23).

With regards to claim 14: Shortland et al. further discloses a reinforcing support, preferably a glass fibre reinforced non-woven support (page 2, lines 21-22).

With regards to claim 15: Shortland et al. discloses a floor covering (1) having a decorative upper surface (page 3, lines 7-11) and a lower surface (fig. 1).

Shortland et al. discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to disclose one or more studs formed on the lower surface of the floor covering, where an air gap is formed between the lower surface of the floor covering and the upper surface of the floor.

However, Oakley discloses flooring tile having one or more studs formed on the lower surface so as to provide ventilation when laying the floor covering on a floor (col. 1, lines 9-11; col. 4, lines 71-78).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the floor covering of Shortland et al. to include one or more studs formed on the lower surface of the floor covering as taught by Oakley in order to provide means for ventilation (col. 4, lines 71-78)

With regards to claim 17: Shortland et al. further discloses the floor covering (1) is a slip resistant floor covering (page. 3, lines 7-11)

With regards to claim 18: Shortland et al. discloses a floor covering (1) having a decorative upper surface (page 3, lines 7-11) and a lower surface (fig. 1).

Shortland et al. discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to disclose one or more studs formed on the lower surface of the floor covering, where an air gap is formed between the lower surface of the floor covering and the upper surface of the floor

However, Oakley discloses flooring tile having one or more studs formed on the lower surface so as to provide ventilation when laying the floor covering on a floor (col. 1, lines 9-11; col. 4, lines 71-78).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the floor covering of Shortland et al. to include one or more studs formed on the lower surface of the floor covering as taught by Oakley in order to provide a means for ventilation (col. 4, lines 71-78).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shortland et al. (WO 00/42274) in view of Oakley (GB 690,863), and in further view of Fanti (US 2001/0034983 A1) and Daugherty et al. (US 5,597,194).

With regards to claim 4: Shortland, in view of Oakley, discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to discloses the being the lower surface being roughened chemically using a blowing agent to ensure that there is adequate grip between the lower surface of the floor covering and the floor to which is applied.

However, Fanti discloses a flooring covering (par. 0001) having a roughened surface lower surface to enhance the securement of the flooring to the surface in which it is to be laid (par. 0015).

Daughtery et al. discloses a plastic net that is high friction and non-slip, where a surface of the net includes component blend having a blowing agent that creates a roughened pattern (abstract & claim 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the floor covering of Shortland et al., in view of Oakley, to include a roughened lower surface as taught by Fanti, wherein the roughed surface is created by a blowing agent as taught by Daugherty et al. in order to provide a lower surface having a greater coefficient of friction with the surface in which it was laid for increased stability and securement. The chemical modification of the lower surface of the floor covering will allow for increased time and cost savings as no additional steps would be required when compared to that of mechanical modification.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shortland et al. (WO 00/42274) in view of Oakley (GB 690,863), and in further view of Bergishagen (US 5,063,251).

With regards to claim 10: Shortland et al. further discloses the plastics material is in the amount of 100 to 200 parts per hundred part of plastics material (php), a filler preferably in the amount of 0 to 100 php, thermal stabilizer preferably in an amount of 1 to 3 php, and/or a pigment preferable in amount of 1 to 3 php (page 8, lines 5-8). It is noted that the Examiner considers the unit, Phr (parts per hundred of resin), to be equivalent to unit, Php (parts per hundred parts of plastic), as both pertain to a plastisol material.

Shortland et al., previously modified by Oakley, discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to disclose a blowing agent in an amount of 0 to 2 php.

However, Bergishagen discloses a blowing agent for use with flooring tile (col. 1, lines 33-35), where a cell structure is formed when a blowing agent is used with conjunction of plastic material (col. 1, line 59 - col. 2, lines 4). Bergishagen further discloses a blowing agent preferably in an amount from 0 to 2 php (col. 4, lines 44-61).

Therefore, it would obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the floor covering of Shortland et al., in view of Oakley, to include a blowing agent in the amount of 0 to 2 php as taught by Bergishagen in order to expand of the floor covering plastic material for a light-weight plastic foam

structure when compared to conventional plastic flooring material covering the identical area.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shortland et al. (WO 00/42274) in view of Oakley (GB 690,863) and in further view of Weaver et al. (US 3,385,722).

With regards to claim 20: Shortland et al., in view of Oakley, discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to disclose the floor covering is wound onto a core.

However, Weaver et al. discloses a plastics surface covering that is wound onto a roll (fig. 1; col. 1, lines 15-19; col. 5, lines 6-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the floor covering of Shortland et al., previously modified by Oakley, to have a floor covering wound onto a roll (core) as taught by Weaver et al. in order to provide a floor covering that is presented in a form for ease of handling and transporting.

With regards to claim 21: Shortland et al. discloses a decorative single sheet plastics floor covering comprising a decorative upper surface (fig. 1; pg. 1, lines 1-5; pg. 6, lines 21-25).

Shortland et al. discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to disclose one or more studs formed on the lower surface of the floor covering.

However, Oakley discloses flooring tile having one or more studs formed on the lower surface so as to provide ventilation (col. 4, lines 71-78; figs. 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the floor covering of Shortland et al. to include one or more studs formed on the lower surface of the floor covering as taught by Oakley in order to provide means for ventilation (col. 4, lines 71-78).

Shortland et al., in view of Oakley, discloses everything previously mentioned, but fails to disclose the floor covering is wound onto a core.

However, Weaver et al. discloses a plastics surface covering that is wound onto a core (fig. 1; col. 1, lines 15-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the floor covering of Shortland et al., previously modified by Oakley, to have floor covering wound onto a roll (core) as taught by Weaver et al. in order to provide a floor covering that is presented in form for ease of handling and transporting.

The floor covering of Shortland et al., in view of Oakley and Weaver et al., is capable of loose laying on an upper surface of a floor so that, in use, an air gap is formed between the lower surface of the floor covering and the upper surface of the floor sufficient to ventilate the floor. Note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior

art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the Kotler does not disclose or suggest a single sheet plastic floor covering, but instead discloses a modular tile for interlocking with other similar tile to form a surface covering. In response, Examiner notes that the claims do not recite the boundaries and/or dimensions of the flooring. Broadly interpreted, a single tile of Kotler is considered a single sheet plastic covering.

Applicant further argues the flat finish or texture of Kotler is not “decorative" and that there is no disclosure or suggestion of a "pigment and/or PVC chip.” In response, Examiner notes the term ‘decorative ‘is a subjective term which may vary from person to person. Examiner further notes that a flat finish and texture is widely considered in the art as type of decoration, Wordnet defines a ‘finish’ as “*a decorative texture or appearance of a surface (or the substance that gives it that appearance); "the boat had a metallic finish"; "he applied a coat of a clear finish"; "when the finish is too thin it is difficult to apply evenly*"". In response to applicant’s arguments that Kotler fails to disclose a pigment and/or PVC chips, Examiner submits the claim as recited, the floor covering may include any type decoration known in the floor art, which may or may not

be a pigment and/or PVC chips. When the claim is read in light of the specification, those skilled in the art would recognize the “decorative element” can include any other suitable decorative finish (lines 12-15, pg. 4 of applicant's disclosure). If applicant’s intention was to claim the pigment and/or PVC chips, Examiner suggests deletion of the phrase "such as" for better clarity and precision of the claimed language. MPEP 2173.02 [R-3].

Applicant further argues the Kotler does not disclose or suggest a wear layer. Applicant notes the top surface (30) of Kotler is the upper surface of the cushion plate and not a further layer. Examiner submits the cushion plate (12) which includes a top surface (30) is indeed a further layer as is a separate material separate from the grid (col. 4, line 65 - col. 5, line 6; col. 5, lines 41-45). Further, the cushion plate which is adapted for foot traffic or in other words, everyday wear and tear, is considered a wear layer as it specifically designed to withstand outside conditions.

Applicant further argues that floor of Shortland et al. is not constructed from India-rubber or rubber, so it would not be expected to suffer from the problems of the tiles of Oakley. In response, Examiner submits that Oakley discloses the invention applies to India-rubber or like tiles (col. 3 lines 53-58), which Examiner considers to include tiles of various materials (i.e. plastic) and configurations known in the flooring art. Further, Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants assertion the teaching of Oakley would not be relevant to Shortland. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation

to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Oakley discloses that tile having no current of air would be susceptible to moisture from concrete or the like (col. 3, lines 36-48). As such, Oakley teaches channels formed by studs in order to provide a ventilated surface.

Applicant further argues that Shortland et al. discloses a plastisol material but asserts the plastisol is applied to the upper surface of the non-woven support and not on the lower layer. Examiner notes that applicant has not provided the citation in which Shortland et al. discloses there is plastisol only on the upper of the non-woven support. Examiner submits Shortland discloses a base (2), which includes the lower surface, is formed from the plastisol material (pg. 2, lines 17-22).

Applicant further argues that neither Shortland et al. nor Oakley disclose the use of cyclodextrin, therefore the teaching of adding a blowing agent to a floor covering as taught Bergishagen is incompatible as the composition of Bergishagen includes cyclodextrin. In response, Examiner submits that Bergishagen discloses that both the cyclodextrin and the blowing agents function as the blowing agent (col. 2, lines 18-21). As per the modification, the blowing agent would include a cyclodextrin when used in a plastic material.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The objection of claim 7 has been withdrawn in view of the amendment filed 7/16/08.

The rejection of claims 9-10 have been withdrawn in view of the amendment filed 7/16/08.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JESSIE FONSECA whose telephone number is (571)272-7195. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Canfield can be reached on (571)272-6840. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. F./

Examiner, Art Unit 3633

/Robert J Canfield/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3635